

In re Application of:
MOK, et al.

Group Art Unit: 2818

Examiner: David Vu

For: TWO POSITION ANNEAL CHAMBER

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

October 20, 2006
Date

Năm 7. Cap

REPLY BRIEF

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Identification Page.....	1
2.	Table of Contents	2
3.	Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed	3
4.	Arguments	4
5.	Conclusion	5

Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed

1. Claims 1-21 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by *Yang et al.* (US 2004/0016637).

ARGUMENTS

A. Rejection of Claims 1-21 and 26-29 over *Yang et al.*

Claims 1-21 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by *Yang et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0016637; serial number 10/616,284). The Examiner states that the effective filing date of *Yang et al.* for subject matter claimed by Applicants is July 24, 2002, the filing date of a provisional application 60/398,345. Applicants have respectfully traversed the rejections on grounds that the claimed subject matter of the instant application has an effective filing date prior to the effective filing date of the subject matter relied on in *Yang et al.*

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner erroneously relies on disclosure of an annealing system in *Yang et al.* because the relevant reference date of the subject matter relied on in *Yang et al.* is not earlier than the effective filing date April 18, 2003 of the present application.

The Examiner argues, in the Examiner's Answer dated September 12, 2006, that *Yang et al.* claims priority to a provisional application 60/435,121, filed December 19, 2002, which teaches an annealing chamber system in paragraph [0021] and provides subject matter relied on in the 102(e) rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner erred in asserting that provisional application 60/435,121 teaches subject matter claimed in the present application. The provisional application 60/435,121 discloses an anneal chamber (Paragraph [0021]). However, the provisional application 60/435,121 does not teach a semiconductor processing platform comprising a plurality of annealing chambers, as set forth in claims 1, 10 and 26, and claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection based on *Yang et al.* and allowance of claims 1-21 and 26-29 are respectively requested.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner erroneously rejected claims 1-21 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Yang et al.* Thus, Applicants respectfully request reversal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-21 and 26-29.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Appellant(s)